

VZCZCXYZ0000
RR RUEHWEB

DE RUEHFR #0111/01 0331434
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 021434Z FEB 10
FM AMEMBASSY PARIS
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 8192
RUEHSS/OECD POSTS COLLECTIVE
RUEHUNV/USMISSION UNVIE VIENNA 0729
RUEHNE/AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI 1358

UNCLAS PARIS 000111

SIPDIS

SENT FROM USOECD

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [AORC](#) [ENRG](#) [KNNP](#) [TRGY](#) [ISCA](#) [IEA](#) [OECD](#)
SUBJECT: REPORT OF THE 119TH NUCLEAR ENERGY AGENCY STEERING
COMMITTEE MEETING, OCTOBER 29-30, 2009

REF: (09) SECSTATE 110381

11. SUMMARY: The OECD/Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) Steering Committee met October 29-30, 2009 at OECD headquarters in Paris. Chairman Richard Stratford (U.S.) was reelected as Chair of the Steering Committee. The meeting took place against a backdrop of developments which indicate heightened interest in nuclear power: these include Belgium's recent announcement to postpone its nuclear phase-out, the German government's announcement that it is committed to allow its NPP to operate longer and Italy's renewed interest in nuclear energy. Faced with the prospect of a second biennium of zero nominal growth (ZNG) and rising demands on the agency, the Steering Committee agreed to set up an Advisory Group on a Sustainable NEA budget to provide options to the Steering Committee at its next session for the 2011-2012 budget. In addition to routine business, the Steering Committee agreed to the participation of Indian experts on an ad hoc basis in a selected number of nuclear safety-related committees and working groups would be of mutual benefit. The Steering Committee also agreed to permit Poland to participate as an ad hoc participant in 10 NEA Working Parties. The High-Level Group on the Security of Supply of Medical Radioisotopes reported that it will study whether there has been market failure in the supply chain. If this proves to be the case, the study will provide recommendations on how to address this failure in order to create an environment that encourages sufficient investment in medical radioisotope production and related infrastructure. End Summary.

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the Agenda (NEA/NE/A(2009)2)

12. The Agenda was adopted without comment.

Agenda Item 2: Minutes (NEA/NE/M(2009)1)

13. The Minutes of the April 28-29, 2009 meeting were approved without comment.

Agenda Item 3: Report of the Director-General (Oral)

14. The Director-General's opening oral comments provided a general review of emerging interest in nuclear energy, including the many "New Entrant" countries discussed at the September IAEA General Conference, in particular that these included NEA member Turkey and OECD member Poland. He commented on Belgium's recent announcement to postpone its nuclear phase-out, the new German government's announcement it is committed to allow its NPP to operate longer and Italy's renewed interest in nuclear energy. The Director-General highlighted that the EU recently adopted a multibillion Euro plan for new energy investment, including the objective that the first

prototype of a Generation-IV (GEN-IV) nuclear reactor should be in operation by 2020. Of particular note was his comment that according to the 2009 IEA "World Energy Outlook," the IEA is now explicitly considering that the development of nuclear power technology must be accelerated, promoted and relied upon if the world is to stabilize carbon dioxide emissions at an acceptable level.

15. The Director-General provided an overview of the June 2009 OECD Ministerial Meeting which endorsed a Declaration on Green Growth and whose attendees included the five accession countries (Chile, Estonia, Israel, Russia, and Slovenia). The October 2009 IEA Ministerial focused on "Responding to Energy Challenges in Partnership" (Public-Private) and included participation of China, India, Russia and energy industries. The Director-General covered the status of NEA relations with China, Russia and the IAEA. He informed the Steering Committee that Romania has requested to become a formal observer in a number of OECD bodies, including the NEA. His remarks also included a review of activities in the areas of nuclear safety and regulation, radioactive waste management and decommissioning, radiological protection, nuclear science, nuclear development, legal affairs and the Data Bank.

16. Lastly the Director-General commented on the status of three important reference publications:

-- The Red Book. The publication of the "Uranium: Resources, Production and Demand" is released biennially in cooperation with the IAEA. The last edition was published in 2008 and the next edition is anticipated to be published in June 2010. Preliminary results indicate that the financial crisis continues to have a moderating effect on exploration expenditures and mine development. Nonetheless, resources continue to increase and production is also

increasing, albeit less rapidly, at least in part because lengthy mine development in many jurisdictions remains an issue.

-- The Brown Book. The 2009 edition of "Nuclear Energy Data" is now available. A timely source of NPP data, the book reports that in addition to the 15 reactors currently under construction in the OECD area (14 in 2008), the number of firmly committed reactors has jumped from 13 in 2008 to 23 in 2009, many due to the U.S. government considering that 9 reactors now fall in this category.

-- The Yellow Book. The Decommissioning Cost Estimation Book is currently undergoing revision in collaboration with the IAEA and the European commission. It is scheduled for completion in 2010 and will include a) a revision of the listing of cost items to take account of experience gained from 10 years of using the current cost structure, and b) the development of a Users Manual to guide users in applying the cost structure and to ensure greater harmonization of approaches to cost reporting.

17. The Director-General's report was followed by general comments from Belgium, Germany (clarifying the German government's views on continued operation of its nuclear power plant), Iceland, Japan (HGTR status), Netherlands, and Switzerland (both the Netherlands and Switzerland requested a report at the April 2010 Steering Committee meeting on the work of the High-level Group on the Security of Medical Isotopes). USDEL expressed its support for the High-level Group, noting the importance of its work when there is a critical shortage of isotopes worldwide.

Agenda Item 4: Program of Work (POW) and Budget for 2009-2010
(NEA/NE(2009)8)

18. Deputy-Director Janice Dunn Lee provided a recap of the April 2009 Steering Committee meeting, including an overview of the budget challenges in relation to the significant down-sizing affect on the Program of Work (POW). In this process 6 Secretariat posts were frozen. Ms. Dunn Lee announced two donor Cost-Free Project Posts were added; one in the area of radioisotopes and the second nuclear safety coordinator to develop a program for New Entrant Countries. She pointed out the Steering Committee at its October meeting is invited to approve the adoption of a zero nominal growth (ZNG) budgetary envelope for 2010 and down-sizing adjustments to the

Program of Work for 2009-2010. The Deputy Director-General stressed that the current budget impasse on reaching a stable and sustainable core budget consensus is beyond the Secretariat's ability to resolve therefore the Steering Committee must solve the problem. Interventions by Korea and Switzerland noted the importance of effectively using resources given the state of the global economy. The U.S. intervention noted the need for a clarification of what the Nuclear Safety Coordinator Cost-Free Expert for Entrant Countries would be doing, also noting that the Steering Committee had not approved any Entrant Country activities

19. The Deputy Director commented that Member Countries should be mindful of members' expressed desire to fulfill the original POW, noting the Secretariat proposed that members who wish to do so should consider voluntary contribution to be used to make up the short-fall in areas of the POW that were being curtailed through the imposition of ZNG and the down-sized POW. She noted that to date only one member country had offered a voluntary contribution in the area of radioactive waste management. Her comments were followed by a number of interventions. The South Korean Delegate stated Korea was unclear as to the meaning and definition of voluntary contributions and cost-free experts. Austria raised the issue of transparency as to what projects and activities were being supported by the voluntary contributions and cost-free experts, the Steering Committee needs to be knowledgeable on what is financed by voluntary contributions. The Austrian Delegate stated he was at a loss as to why there was a need to discuss the importance of voluntary contributions on the basis of one contribution. He also raised the issue of outsourcing Secretariat services for the Generation IV consortium (GEN-IV). The Director General stated that a POW agreed by the Steering Committee was not distorted by a single voluntary contribution; voluntary contributions were only accepted which are consistent with the Program of Work (in line with OECD practices) and after member approval. Interventions by Australia, Germany and Sweden supported the Chair's view on the potential affect of voluntary contributions. The Swedish Delegate raised the issue as to what do Member States want the NEA to do. The Deputy-Director noting the concerned interventions raised by delegates and pledged to improve the transparency of voluntary contributions and cost-free experts contributions to the POW.

Agenda Item 5: Steering Committee Advisory Group for a Sustainable
NEA Budget: Options Paper (NEA/NE(2009)11

10. After an overview by the Secretariat of the proposed three options for establishing an advisory group, the Chairman provided his view that there should be clear direction to the Secretariat, as well as a clear idea of what is to be the product and what the Steering Committee wants or needs. The Steering Committee delegations took note of the Chairman's introductory comments and after considerable debate on the merits of a budget advisory group delegations supported its creation with a suggested mandate. There was consensus that the Steering Committee should be kept informed in a timely manner of the Group's deliberations, both via reports at Steering Committee meetings and electronically between sessions. After delegate discussion and revisions to the draft mandate text, the US DEL joined consensus in approving the mandate as below:

BEGIN MANDATE TEXT:

Steering Committee Mandate Directive for Steering Committee Budget
Advisory Group for a Sustainable NEA Budget

-- Mandate: Assist and advise the Steering Committee on how best to provide the NEA with a sustainable budget to complete its Program of Work for 2011-2012

-- Specific Terms of Reference: to be considered by the group and notified to the Steering Committee

-- Open-ended for the group itself; a smaller drafting group will likely be needed

-- Desired Composition: technical and budget experts from a representative range of member countries (small, medium and large;

broad geographical coverage)

-- Structure: Chair to be elected; no Bureau; NEA Secretariat to provide staff support; quorum not an issue

-- Number and frequency of meetings: to be determined by the group, with a first meeting suggested to take place before the end of 2009, and one of the other meetings possibly during the days preceding the April 2010 session of the Steering Committee

-- Relationship to the Steering Committee: to report to the Steering Committee formally at its April 2010 session; interim reports to be provided electronically as appropriate; the group does not have decision-making powers itself

-- Product: written recommendations to be presented to the Steering Committee at its April 2010 session and October 2010 session as appropriate

-- Nominations: Member countries will be asked to nominate experts by November 30, 2009

END MANDATE TEXT

Agenda Item 6: Participation of Poland in NEA Committees and Working Parties (NEA/NE(2009)9

¶11. At its 115th Session, the Steering Committee approved the request by Poland to participate as an ad hoc OECD Member Participant in the activities of the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH), the Radioactive Waste Management Committee (RWMC), and the Nuclear Development Committee (NSC) and the NSC Working Party on Scientific Issues of the Fuel Cycle and the Working Party on Scientific Issues of Reactor Systems.

On August 3, 2009, Poland requested renewal of participation in these committees and expressed interest in ad hoc participation in the Committee on the Safety of Nuclear Installations (CSNI), the Committee on Nuclear Regulatory Activities (CNRA), CNRA Working Group on Regulation of New Reactors (WGRN), the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH) Working Party on Nuclear Energy Matters (WPNEM), and the Nuclear Law Committee (NLC).

After affirmative interventions by France, Germany, Korea, the Slovak Republic, and Sweden, the Steering Committee by unanimous consensus approved Poland's request.

Agenda Item 7: NEA Committee Mandates and Structures - Update (NEA/NE(2009)10

¶12. There was no discussion on the Standing Technical Committee (STC) Mandates and Structures document, because the document was not available to delegations until the first day of the Steering

Committee Meeting.

NOTE: The U.S. brief review found a number of changes to the mandates, in particular non-government participants, which raised concern and need for further review and discussion.

Agenda Item 8: Status Report on GIF Activities and NEA Involvement (Oral Report)

¶13. The Generation IV International Forum (GIF) is not a NEA core program under the oversight of the NEA Steering Committee nor a cooperative arrangement. The GIF concept originated in the United States and has expanded with the assistance of the NEA Secretariat. The United States/DOE and Japan are the primary funders. GIF is a consortium of interested countries (without independent offices or permanent staff) consisting of: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Japan, Korea, Russia, South Africa, Switzerland, UK, USA, and EURATOM. The IAEA is an observer. Argentina, Brazil and the UK are non-active members. The NEA functions as the technical secretariat and provides offices, and staff assistance. Thierry

Dujardin, NEA Deputy Director, Science and Development, provided an overview of 2008 activities regarding project arrangements, policy group meetings, and the 2009 Symposium, September 9-10, 2009 in Paris. He reported on NEA Technical Secretariat Activities, including 50 meetings; 30 teleconferences; organizational preparation, preparation of agenda, drafting of minutes, and follow-up, editing documents, etc.; and the IT website and public website. He noted that the NEA Secretariat staff is well integrated in all technical activities, however it is more time consuming than first anticipated.

Agenda Item 9: NEA Relations with India: Proposals for Cooperation
(NEA/NE(2009)12)

¶14. Following exchanges with delegations on the proposed ad hoc participation of India prior to the Steering Committee meeting, "Actions by the Steering Committee" were amended as follows:

"The Steering Committee shall be invited to:

- 1) Note the recent Safeguards Agreement and Additional Protocol concluded between India and the IAEA and the conclusion of bilateral agreements with India in the field of non-proliferation and the peaceful use of nuclear energy;
- 2) The willingness of India to align with international best practices in regulating and operating its nuclear power plants for civil use;
- 3) Note the significant experience of Indian experts in nuclear energy based on past and present autonomous development in research, and the operation and regulation of nuclear power plants; and agree that the participation of Indian experts on an ad hoc basis in a selected number of nuclear safety-related committees and working groups is meaningful and would be of mutual benefit;
- 4) Agree that Indian technical experts could be invited on an ad hoc basis to the meetings of the standing technical committees and working groups listed in PARA 13 (NA/NE(2009)12), except for the Expert Group on Integral Experiments for Minor Actinide Management and the Working Party on Multi-scale Modeling of fuels and Structural Materials for Nuclear Systems (WPMMS) of the Nuclear Science committee (NSC);
- 5) Note that India could be participating in the future in nuclear safety-related OECD/NEA Joint Projects and the MDEP; and
- 6) Reconfirm the step-by-step approach for cooperation within the scope of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Statement on Civil Nuclear cooperation with India of September 6, 2008 and with potential applications in Indian Facilities under IAEA safeguards, and request the Director General to report annually to the Steering Committee on NEA cooperation with India.

Minor interventions were made by Canada, Japan, Korea, and Sweden. Consensus supported an interest to have India participate in standing technical committees on an ad hoc case-by-case basis.

Agenda Item 10: Status Report by the Chair of the Nuclear Law
Committee (Oral Report)

¶15. Mr. Dussart Desart, Chairman of the Nuclear Law Committee (NLC)

presented an overview of the status of the Committee's Program of Work, including impacts of environmental law, the Protocols amending the Paris and Brussels Supplementary Conventions, the new topical approach and further themes under consideration for study. Of particular interest was the New Policy related to observers from NGOs. NGOs and industry must submit an application for participation pursuant to OECD Council guidelines. The new policy does not affect a National Delegation's ability to determine the composition of its delegation.

Agenda Item 11: Status Report by the Chair of the CRPPH (Oral Report)

¶16. Dr. Ann McGarry, Chairman of the Committee on Radiation Protection and Public Health (CRPPH) presented an overview of "Radiation Protection in Today's World: Contributions of the CRPPH. She noted the Committee's approach is to: 1) identify topics of common or international interest; 2) Address agreed issues, and 3) survey the horizon for possible emerging issues. Her presentation addressed principles areas of current interest, the current context of radiological protection, the new ICRP Recommendations, new nuclear build, the stakeholder roles in decision making, science and values, radiological protection of the environment, nuclear emergency management and the forthcoming 2010 INEX-4 which will explore national and international issues in management of consequences in an urban environment, and occupational exposure at NPPs.

Agenda Item 12: Report on the MDEP Conference Held in Paris 9/10-11/2009 (Oral Report)

¶17. The Multinational Design Evaluation Program (MDEP) is not a NEA core program under the oversight of the NEA Steering Committee nor a cooperative arrangement. Like the GIF, it is funded by voluntary contributions (primarily from the United States/NRC and Japan). The MDEP concept originated in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and expanded with the support of the NEA Secretariat. MDEP is now a consortium of regulatory authorities, from Canada, China, Finland, France, Japan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, South Africa, U.S. and the U.S. MDEP does not have independent offices, permanent staff, or an operational budget. The NEA functions as the technical secretariat and provides offices, and staff assistance. Javier Reig, Head of the NEA Nuclear Safety Division, reported on the MDEP Conference on New Reactor Design Activities, September 10-11, 2009. The goal of the conference was to share results obtained with industry and non-MDEP regulators. Held at the OECD headquarters in Paris, the Conference had approximately 170 attendees from 23 different countries, 11 national/international organizations (IAEA, EC, WENRA, EURELECTRIC, EUR, WNA/CORDEL, INSAG, ASME, AFCEN, and FORATOM), and vendors, licensees/operators, and component manufacturers. The conference conclusions included among a number of points: 1) great expectations from MDEP for worldwide certification of new designs, 2) standardization and harmonization, 3) convergence of regulatory practices will finally lead to convergence of regulatory requirements and standardization within the present MDEP framework, and 4) certification and approval of components. It was announced that Sweden and India have requested to join. Korea raised an intervention regarding harmonization, noting it would be difficult to harmonize standards when there are different standards from country-to-country. The Secretariat responded that it could be similar practices and that it all depends on what factors are included. Slovakia's intervention noted that MDEP provides reports periodically to the CNRA and the CSNI Standing Technical Committees.

Agenda Item 13: Report on the Financing of Nuclear Power Plants (Oral Report)

¶18. A report by the Secretariat Nuclear Development Division, on the Nuclear Development Committee (NDC) Ad Hoc Experts Group on Financing Nuclear Power Plants (FNPP) study (2007-2008 POW), for the purpose of publishing an 18-month study, Report on Financing NPPs. He highlighted that the participants were a mix of government and industry representatives, including 7 member states, plus the EC, the IEA, the IAEA, World Nuclear Association (WNA). (NOTE: The Ad Hoc Group was chaired by the Chief Investment Counsel, Bechtel Power Corporation, and published in November 2009). The only intervention

was by the Austria delegate on the difficulty of financial market regulation. However, in corridor discussions several delegations again raised sensitivities over the merits of publishing this study when the format, objectives, and summary, are closely similar to an IAEA study and report done some time ago. (Comment: Turkey raised the duplication issue in the April NEA Steering Committee April 2009 session as to why the NEA did not approach the IAEA to do a joint report. The Secretariat responded at that time that the NEA participated in many IAEA studies and that in turn IAEA had been an active participant in the NEA study on financing of Nuclear Power Plants. Director General Echavarri described the NEA/IAEA relationship as professional and collaborative. End comment)

Agenda Item 14: Activities of Other Parts of the OECD (Oral Reports)

OECD/International Energy Agency (IEA):

¶19. Mr. Nobuo Tanaka, Executive Director, International Energy Agency (IEA) presented an overview of world-wide climate change interests and the linkage between energy and climate change. The OECD is preparing an "OECD Policy Brief" for the COP-15 in Copenhagen Conference and the need to reach CO2 emission target reductions. A main focus of his presentation was the role of energy technology roadmaps and the inclusion of technology development milestones. The IEA and the NEA are cooperating on developing a Nuclear Energy Roadmap for the new edition of the "IEA Energy Technology Perspectives (ETP)." The aim is to set out the necessary steps to achieve the nuclear expansion envisaged in the ETP 2008 "Blue Map" scenario, covering technology development, policy measures and resources. This will be published as part of a series of roadmaps being prepared by the IEA in response to a request from the G-8 summit. He further pointed out there is a need for a clear definition of the role of nuclear power in a clean energy future.

OECD Environment Directorate:

¶20. Rob Visser, Acting Director, Environment Directorate, presented an overview of the OECD Council Ministerial "Green Growth Declaration, adopted on June 25, 2009. The Declaration was agreed by the Ministers of Finance, Economy, Trade, foreign Affairs, and Environment. The Declaration involves expanding green markets, price pollution and natural resource use properly, manages transition to green growth at level of employment, foster green technology and innovation, and investment in green infrastructures.

OECD Trade and Agriculture Directorate (EX-IM Credits):

¶21. Julian Paisey, of the OECD Trade and Agriculture Directorate, Export Credits Division, (www.oecd.org/trade/xcred) presented an overview on New OECD Disciplines on Export Credits for Nuclear Power Plants, focusing on the more favorable EM-IM financial terms and credit/repayment terms. The New Sector Understanding took on July 1, 2009 and is anticipated to have a positive affect in both the near and long-term.

Agenda Item 15: Election of the Bureau

¶22. The Steering Committee elected the following Bureau Members for 2010:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| -- Richard Stratford/U.S. | Chairman |
| -- Mr. Frederic Mondolini/France (new member) | Vice-Chairman |
| -- Dr. Jozef Ronaky/Hungary | Vice-Chairman |
| -- Mr. Takayuki Shirao/Japan | Vice-Chairman |
| -- Mr. Kjell Bendiksen/Norway | Vice-Chairman |

Agenda Item 16: Dates of the Next Meeting

¶23. Member States consensus approved the meetings dates of April 21-22, 2010 for the spring session and October 28-29, 2010 for the fall session.

Agenda Item 17: Other Business

¶24. Room Document on NEA Co-sponsored Conferences and Symposia 2010-2012. Delegates took note of the Room Document on NEA Co-sponsored Conferences and Symposia 2010-2012 without comment.

¶25. Room Document Fact Sheet on Helium-3 Shortage: The Chair introduced and provided a short background overview on the Worldwide Helium-3 shortage. He suggested that this issue could be considered as a discussion topic at a future NEA Steering Committee meeting.

¶26. Report of the High-Level Group on the Security of Supply of Medical Radioisotopes: Sylvana Guindon, of the Canadian Delegation, reported on the first meeting of the High-Level Group held in Canada in June 2009. A second meeting is planned for December 14-15, 2009 in Paris. The Group as currently comprised has 20 experts from 11 countries, the European Commission, and the IAEA. As planned, the Group developed its mandate. At its first meeting, the group focused on ensuring that supply and demand information is available and shared amongst all stakeholders. It then began assessing options to increase short-, medium- and long-term production. As part of the Terms of Reference, the NEA is undertaking an economic analysis of the upstream Molybdenum-99 and Technetium-99m supply chain. This study will develop a solid factual basis to determine whether there has been a market failure in the supply chain. If so, the study will provide recommendations on how to address this failure in order to create an environment that encourages sufficient investment in medical radioisotope production and related infrastructure. This effort is funded through voluntary contributions. Ms. Guindon also noted the Canadian NRU reactor, unexpectedly shut down in May 2009, is still off line, and shutdown is anticipated to continue until the first quarter of 2010. She further noted that supplier countries have stepped up production to help meet the shortage.

Suggested Topics for Policy Debates in 2010

¶27. There was a short discussion of suggested topics for the 2010 Policy debates. Consensus supported:

April: Cost of Generating Electricity through 2009
October: Small and Medium Size Reactors

(NOTE: The NEA "Small and Medium Size Reactors Report" will not be available in time for April Meeting)

Policy Debate: NEA Strategic Plan

¶28. In October 2008 the Steering Committee agreed to extend the 2005-2009 NEA Strategic Plan by one year, until December 2010, to align the Strategic Plan with the OECD biennial budgetary system. It also would accommodate the time needed to draft and publish an update to the 2008 Nuclear Energy Outlook." In April 2009 the Steering Committee agreed to a five step plan: 1) Assessment of the implementation of the current Strategic Plan, 2) Preparation of a first draft of the next Strategic Plan (July-December 2009), 3) Steering Committee Policy Debate (October 2009), 4) Collection and integration of comments from member countries (January-March 2010), and finalization of the draft for discussion and approval by the Steering committee (April 2010). For the most part, member countries indicated that the plan was fine as is and did not envision a substantive rewrite. The Director-General convened a 5-member High-Level Advisory Group (HLAG) Dr. Peter Lyons, US/DOE Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy; Dr. Ann McGarry, Chief Executive, Ireland Radiological Protection Institute; Dr. David Torgerson, Senior Technical Advisor, Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd.; Mr. Toru Ogawa, Director-General, Japan Atomic Energy

Agency; and Mr. Philippe Pradel, Director, International Developments, Commissariat a l Energie Atomique, France.

¶29. The Policy debate opened with remarks from Director General Echavarri, at which time he took the opportunity to comment on ZNG v. ZRG issues and the \$1 million Euro shortfall; the need to maintain the level of the POW as in the past; the questionnaire results, issues that differed from the past, in particular the inclusion of "New Entrant Countries" and developing new leadership role tools, current objectives and priorities and the OECD Counsel on mission organizational priorities and that output should correspond to POW expectations. The Deputy Director General presented the results of the NEA Questionnaire, followed by Summary views of the HLAG presented by Dr. Ann McGarry and Mr. Philippe Pradel.

¶30. Nearly every delegation made interventions focusing on what Member Countries want the NEA to be doing. Interventions spoke to issues that extended beyond the purely technical, e.g. transparency; limiting the expansion of non-member countries and avoiding duplication with other international organizations; questions regarding NGO dialogue or interactions; concern over activities

promoting nuclear energy; NEA-IAEA relationship, leaving to the IAEA or others what is not unique to the NEA; establishing a cross-cutting issue inter-agency group (other international organizations); joint publications (other international organizations); closer working relationship with the IEA; concern about adding New Entrant Countries; policy v. technical activities; cross-cutting issues of common interest and the formulation of a NEA topical crosscutting working group; joint sessions of Standing Technical Committees; scheduling of meetings; and adopting a Strategic Plan based on sustainable resources.

¶31. An extended dialogue over the function and purpose of the Data Bank focused on whether or not it should continue as a separate entity within the NEA. Data coordination between the NEA and the IAEA and the possibility of a joint data bank was of interest. Two NEA Member Countries are not members of the Data Bank (including the U.S.), however the IAEA is a member and any member of the IAEA can request data. Concern was raised over protecting intellectual property rights, developing restriction of codes and experimental data, and sensitive data. The Secretariat was requested to provide the Steering Committee a report on the Data Bank addressing issues raised by the NEA Member Countries. Kornbluh